APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,810	01/23/2001	David Francis Meyer	INXT 1014-1	3728

			EXAMINER
22470	7590	07/26/2005	STORK, KYLE R

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/767,810	MEYER ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 April 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-99</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-99</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the amendment filed 27 April 2005.

2.   Claims 1-99 are pending. Claims 1, 21, 40, 61, and 81 are independent. The

rejection of claims 1-99 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 7, 11, 24, 28, 45, 51, 65, 71, 84, and 91 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7, 11, 24, 28, 45, 51, 65, 71, 84, and 91 disclose the conversion of data,

including date data and currency data, to canonical form. These claims are rendered

indefinite due to the lack of a description of what forms are considered standard, or

canonical.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-4, 9-10, 14-23, 31, 34-44, 49-50, 54-64, 69-70, 74-83, 88-89, and 93-99

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmura (US 6138149,

filed 2 June 1998, patented 24 October 2000) and further in view of Pratt et al. (US

6772141, filed 14 December 1999, patented 3 August 2004, hereafter Pratt).

As per independent claim 1, Ohmura discloses a method for processing an

electronic document adapted for delivery to one or more recipients, the electronic

document including a header and a body, the method comprising:

- Processing the electronic document using a program to identify semantic foci

  (column 11, lines 4-20: Here, a user manually identifies semantic foci and a

  program assists in processing (extracting) the information)

- Creating a meta-content index corresponding to the semantic foci (column 5,

  lines 20-27: Here, a database is used for storing indexed information comprising

  meta-content including image data and the address information)

- Combining the meta-content index with the header and the body to provide an

  enhanced document (column 7, lines 1-10: Here, the index information is

  combined with the header and body to generate an enhanced document allowing

  a user to access data)

Ohmura fails to specifically disclose identifying semantic foci automatically. Pratt

discloses automatic identification of semantic foci (column 9, lines 5-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura's method with Pratt's method, since it

would have allowed a user to obtain a weighted listing of documents (Pratt: column 9, lines 5-41).

As per dependent claim 2, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses the method including sending the enhanced electronic document to one or more recipients (column 11, lines 21-26).

As per dependent claim 3, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses the method wherein the electronic document comprises an electronic mail document (column 11, lines 40-63: Here, user B receives an enhanced email from user A. The email received by user B, then may act as an electronic document as specified by claim 1. This email can then be further enhanced by user B, and sent on to other users C; column 4, lines 44-50 and column 5, lines 38-40: Here, the method of processing information requires that the information used as the electronic document be information be provided via a communication network. Further, an email is described as information received via a communication network).

As per dependent claim 4, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses the method including converting the electronic mail document to a markup language format and wherein the meta-content index comprises one or more objects expressed in the markup language adapted for presentation with body in the enhanced document (Figure 9; column 16, line 58- column 7, line 10: Here, the meta-content index

object (45) is expressed in an electronic mail message (44). This email message is in a markup language format, as it is able to display the meta-content index from the markup language displayed in the browser (40)).

As per dependent claim 9, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura discloses the method wherein the semantic foci includes a plurality of types of information, the plurality of types including one or more of email addresses, URLs, dates, currency values, organization names, names of people, names of places, names of products, names of drugs, names of sports teams, names of diseases, and phone numbers (column 5, lines 20-27: Here, address information of the information provider (URL) is disclosed).

As per dependent claim 10, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Pratt further discloses the method wherein the meta-content index comprises entries sorted by the plurality of types (column 9, lines 5-41: Here, names of products (brand names), a type, is disclosed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Pratt's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily obtain clusters of related information (Pratt: column 9, lines 5-41).

As per dependent claim 14, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further

discloses the method including associating hyperlinks with the semantic foci, and

incorporating the hyperlinks into one of the meta-content index and the body (column 5,

lines 20-27: Here, the semantic foci has an address information of the information

provider (hyperlink) associated to the meta-content index).

As per dependent claim 15, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Pratt further discloses

the method wherein the labels facilitating parsing of the enhanced document are used

(column 9, lines 5-41: Here, when a document is parsed, semantic foci are labeled

(flagged) with special field numbers based upon their topic. These labels are used for

clustering related documents together).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Pratt's method,

since it would have allowed a user to easily obtain clusters of related information (Pratt:

column 9, lines 5-41).

As per dependent claim 16, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further

discloses an electronic document attachment (column 2, lines 43-49), and analysis of

information (column 1, line 66- column 2, line 13: Here, analyzed information has a

summary generated).

As per dependent claim 17, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further

discloses the method of generating a summary (column 1, line 66- column 2, line 13), and including information within an enhanced document (column 7, lines 1-10).

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 16 and 17. Claim 18 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 19, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses the method wherein the header includes text suggesting a key subject (column 3, lines 4-16), and including generating a summary of the electronic document based upon the key subject (column 1, lines 66- column 2, line 13), and including information in the enhanced document (column 7, lines 1-10).

As per dependent claim 20, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses the method including a summary of all or part of the electronic document (column 1, lines 66- column 2, line 13) and a meta-content index (column 5, lines 20-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Ohmura's method, since it would have allowed a user to store the summary (Ohmura: column 5, lines 28-37).

As per independent claim 21, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10. Claim 21 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 22 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 23, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 23 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14. Claim 31 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 34 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 35 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 36 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 37 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 38, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Claim 38 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20. Claim 39 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per independent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 40 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 41, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 40, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further

discloses preparing the enhanced document for delivery to one or more recipients (column 7, lines 1-10).

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 42 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 43, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 43 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 44, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 44 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 49, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 49 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 50, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 50 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 54, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14. Claim 54 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 55, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 55 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 56, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 56 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 57, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 57 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 58, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 58 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 59, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Claim 59 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 60, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20. Claim 60 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per independent claim 61, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura further discloses a computer, including an electronic mail client having programmatic resources for composing an electronic document having a header and a body, and for sending electronic documents to one or more recipients (Figure 9; column 11, lines 4-20). Claim 61 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 62, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 41. Claim 62 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 63, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 63 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 64, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 64 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 69, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 69 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 70, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 70 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 74, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14. Claim 74 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 75, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 75 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 76, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 76 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 77, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 77 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 78, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 78 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 79, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Claim 79 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 80, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20. Claim 80 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per independent claim 81, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 81 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 82, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 82 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 83, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 83 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 88, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 88 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 89, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 89 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 93, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14. Claim 93 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 94, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 94 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 95, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 95 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 96, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 96 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 97, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 97 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 98, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Claim 98 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 99, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20. Claim 99 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

7.   Claims 5, 24, 45, 65, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmura and Pratt and further in view of Hong et al. (US 5710883, filed 10 March 1995, patented 20 January 1998, hereafter Hong).

As per dependent claim 5, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to specifically disclose a document in a format compliant with a standard MIME format.

However, Hong discloses a document in a format compliant with a standard MIME format (column 4, line 65- column 5, line 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Hong's method, since it would have allowed an email to easily be sent in a standard format.

As per dependent claim 24, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 24 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Hong.

As per dependent claim 45, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 45 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Hong.

As per dependent claim 65, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 65 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Hong.

As per dependent claim 84, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 84 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Hong.

8.   Claims 6-7, 25-26, 46-47, 66-67, and 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmura and Pratt and further in view of Engst (Visual Quickstart Guide: Eudora For Windows & Macintosh, 1997).

As per dependent claim 6, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to specifically discloses the method including at least one date within the body, and including:

  •   Identifying a document date within the header

- Associating a presentation attribute to the at least one date in the meta-content index, the presentation attribute based upon a temporal relationship between the document date and the at least one date

However, Engst discloses:

- Identifying a document date within the header (page 22: Here, a document date is the date the document, here, an email, is sent. Figure 13 shows the date a message was sent as "Mon, 23 Jun 1997 13:27:42 –0700." Further, a user is able to add the message to a queue to specify when to deliver a message)

- Associating a presentation attribute to the at least one date in the meta-content index, the presentation attribute based upon a temporal relationship between the document date and the at least one date (page 24, Figure 18: Here, a message with several dates is shown. This message presents the date this message was sent to several users. The dates are displayed temporally, in that the latest date the message was sent is displayed near the top with prior dates being listed below the most recent date. The oldest date is displayed at the bottom of the date list)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Engst method, since it would have allowed a user to visually track the origins of a document.

As per dependent claim 7, Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Engst further

discloses converting the at least one date to canonical form (page 24, Figure 18: Here, all the dates have a standard, canonical, form).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst's method with Engst method, since it would have allowed a user to visually track the origins of a document.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 25 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 26 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 46 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 47 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 66 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 67 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 85 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 86 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst.

9.   Claims 8, 27, 48, 68, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst and further in view of Adler et al. (US

6138130, filed 15 June 1998, patented 24 October 2000, hereafter Adler).

As per dependent claim 8, Ohmura, Pratt, and Engst disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura,

Pratt, and Engst fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the presentation

attribute comprises color. However, Adler discloses the method wherein the

presentation attribute comprises color (column 16, lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Adler's method,

since it would have allowed a user to quickly differentiate between items (Adler: column

16, lines 17-25).

As per dependent claim 27, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 8. Claim 27 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, Engst, and Adler.

As per dependent claim 48, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 8. Claim 48 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, Engst, and Adler.

As per dependent claim 68, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 8. Claim 68 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, Engst, and Adler.

As per dependent claim 87, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 8. Claim 87 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, Engst, and Adler.

10.   Claims 11, 13, 28, 30, 51, 53, 71, 73, 90, and 92 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmura and Pratt and further in view of

Adler.

As per dependent claim 11, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to

specifically disclose the method wherein one of the types comprises currency values,

and including converting the currency values to a canonical form. However, Adler

discloses the method wherein one of the types comprises currency values, and

including converting the currency values to a canonical form (column 7, lines 20-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Adler's method,

since it would have allowed a user to convert several forms of financial information

(Adler: column 7, lines 20-37).

As per dependent claim 13, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to

specifically disclose color coding based on type. However, Adler discloses color coding

based on type (column 16, lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Adler's method,

since it would have allowed a user to quickly determine the object type for a particular

cell (Adler: column 16, lines 17-25).

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 28 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 30, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13. Claim 30 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 32, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to specifically disclose the method including adding presentation attributes to entries in the meta-content index according to the plurality of types. However, Adler discloses the method including adding presentation attributes to entries in the meta-content index according to the plurality of types (column 16, lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Adler's method, since it would have allowed a user to quickly determine the object type for a particular cell (Adler: column 16, lines 17-25).

As per dependent claim 33, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to specifically disclose the method including adding presentation attributes to entries in the meta-content index with one of the plurality of types, according to relationships among the entries with the one of the plurality of types. However, Adler discloses the method including adding presentation attributes to entries in the meta-content index with one of the plurality of types, according to relationships among the entries with the one of the plurality of types (column 16, lines 17-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Adler's method,

since it would have allowed a user to quickly determine the object type for a particular

cell (Adler: column 16, lines 17-25).

As per dependent claim 51, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 11. Claim 51 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 53, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 13. Claim 53 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 71, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 11. Claim 71 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 73, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 13. Claim 73 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 90, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 11. Claim 90 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

As per dependent claim 92, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 13. Claim 92 is similarly rejected under Ohmura and Pratt.

11.   Claims 12, 29, 52, 72, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ohmura and Pratt and further in view of Logan et al. (US 5732216,

filed 8 January 1990, patented 24 March 1998, hereafter Logan).

As per dependent claim 12, Ohmura and Pratt disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ohmura and Pratt fail to

specifically disclose annotating the body. However, Logan discloses annotation document segments (column 19, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ohmura and Pratt's method with Logan's method, since it would have allowed a user to provide commentary on a document (Logan: column 19, lines 20-45).

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 29 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Logan.

As per dependent claim 52, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 52 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Logan.

As per dependent claim 72, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 72 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Logan.

As per dependent claim 91, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 91 is similarly rejected under Ohmura, Pratt, and Logan.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-99 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Pratt, Engst, and Adler references have been added to address the applicants arguments. Further, additional sections of the Ohmura reference have been cited to address the applicant's belief that Ohmura lacks email. The examiner directs the applicant to column 11, lines 40-63. Here, user B receives an enhanced email from

user A. The email received by user B, then may act as an electronic document as specified by claim 1. This email can then be further enhanced by user B, and sent on to other users C. Further, the examiner directs the applicant to column 4, lines 44-50 and column 5, lines 38-40: Here, the method of processing information requires that the information used as the electronic document be information be provided via a communication network. Further, an email is described as information received via a communication network.

Further, the examiner has cited specific passages within references to address the applicant's concern about references not providing motivation to combine.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER